



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: CONSTANTINOPLE: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *November, 1908.*

ON November 1, 1858, Queen Victoria issued the famous proclamation that closed the horrors of the Indian Mutiny with a word of peace and hope, and announced that henceforward the rule of the East India Company was to cease and the administration of the great dependency to be taken over by the Crown. Fifty years later to the day her son, the present King of England and Emperor of India, issued a further proclamation. The Queen's proclamation outlined a policy and formulated a number of specific pledges; the King's is a ringing, confident claim that that policy has been carried out, those pledges redeemed. But it is more than that. It is one of the most impressive State papers that I have ever had the fortune to come across. In stateliness of language, in its consciousness of power used for noble ends, in its just, tempered, but not vainglorious pride in all that has been accomplished in the British name, and in the spirit of mingled benignity and firmness that breathes in every line, it seems to me a message eminently worthy of a sovereign to whose lot it has fallen to guide the destinies of one-fifth of the human race. It was received in India with a great outburst of loyalty and rejoicing. "We survey our labors of the past half-century," says the King-Emperor, "with clear gaze and good conscience"; and in a passage which I venture to reproduce in full he reviews some of the achievements of the British rulers of India:

"Difficulties such as attend all human rule in every age and place have risen up from day to day. They have been faced by the servants of the British Crown with toil and courage and patience, with deep counsel and a resolution that has never faltered nor shaken. If errors have occurred, the agents of my Government have spared no pains and no self-sacrifice to correct them; if abuses have been proved, vigorous hands have labored to apply a remedy.

"No secret of Empire can avert the scourge of drought and plague, but experienced administrators have done all that skill and devotion are capable of doing to mitigate those dire calamities of Nature. For a longer period than was ever known in your land before you have escaped the dire calamities of war within your borders. Internal peace has been unbroken.

"In the great charter of 1858 Queen Victoria gave you noble assurance of her earnest desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement, and to administer the government for the benefit of all resident therein. The schemes that have been diligently framed and executed for promoting your material convenience and advance—schemes unsurpassed in their magnificence and boldness—bear witness before the world to the zeal with which that benignant promise has been fulfilled.

"The rights and privileges of the Feudatory Princes and Ruling Chiefs have been respected, preserved and guarded; and the loyalty of their allegiance has been unswerving. No man among my subjects has been favored, molested or disquieted by reason of his religious belief or worship. All men have enjoyed protection of the law. The law itself has been administered without disrespect to creed or caste, or to usages and ideas rooted in your civilization; it has been simplified in form, and its machinery adjusted to the requirements of ancient communities slowly entering a new world.

"The charge confided to my Government concerns the destinies of countless multitudes of men now and for ages to come; and it is a paramount duty to repress with a stern arm guilty conspiracies that have no just cause and no serious aim. These conspiracies I know to be abhorrent to the loyal and faithful character of the vast hosts of my Indian subjects, and I will not suffer them to turn me aside from my task of building up the fabric of security and order.

The message goes on to promise "steadfast and sure progress" in admitting natives to "posts of public authority and power," and in extending "the principle of representative institutions." To mark this historic anniversary His Majesty orders the remission or curtailment of sentences on prisoners and announces that at the New Year he will honor the Indian troops with a substantial recognition—in the form, no doubt, of increased pay—of their "martial instincts, their splendid discipline, and their faithful readiness of service." Finally the King-Emperor declares that ever since his visit in 1875 he has watched the interests of India, its Princes and Peoples, "with an affectionate solicitude that time cannot weaken"; and he adds that "these sincere feelings of active sympathy and hope for India on the part of my Royal House and Line only represent, and they do most truly

represent, the deep and united will and purpose of the people of this Kingdom."

I do not think there is a single statement in this remarkably virile and candid proclamation that cannot be fully substantiated. British rule in India has entered just now upon troubled waters, and the need for a hand on the rudder that will be not merely strong, but deft and sensitive, is probably destined to grow in urgency. The successes of the last half-century are not in themselves a guarantee that the wholly novel problems now pressing for solution will be satisfactorily handled. But they afford some encouragement to hope that the future will not fall below the high record of the past. What, at least, will not be disputed is that the achievements of the British since 1858 in extending and consolidating their Indian dominions, in devising a system that sends out the best men the country can produce to administer them, in preserving peace among three hundred million peoples with a British force of less than 80,000 men, in fighting famine and plague, in scrupulously observing all treaties and engagements with the native Princes who still rule two-fifths of the country, in respecting, often with an almost excessive tenderness, the faiths and customs of their wards, in building 30,000 miles of railway and 200,000 miles of roads, in irrigating nearly fifty million acres of land, in quadrupling the value of Indian imports and exports, in dealing out an inflexible and even-handed justice, in introducing industries and improving agriculture, in extending education, in setting up some 750 municipalities and over a thousand district and local boards for the training of the natives in the responsibilities of self-government, and in handing over practically all the subordinate posts in the civil administration and a small but increasing number in the higher grades to Indians—no one, I say, can deny that these achievements constitute a unique record of energetic, upright and successful government. How, having constructed, to assimilate—this is now the fundamental problem confronting the British in India. The whole spirit of the King's proclamation is proof enough, if any were needed, that it will not be shirked.

Since "The Times" twenty-three years ago revealed Germany's intention to force a second war upon France, no newspaper article has made such a profound sensation in England and throughout Europe as the interview with the Kaiser which

appeared in the "Daily Telegraph" in the last week of October. Almost every sentence in it was an indiscretion. After some warm expressions of indignation that the English should still persist in mistrusting his friendship, the Kaiser proceeded to prove its reality by announcing that in the crisis of the Boer war he drew up a plan of campaign and sent it to Queen Victoria at Windsor, and that when Russia suggested and France approved united representations to put an end to the war, the Kaiser stood out and refused to take part in any anti-British movement.

These were the principal revelations of an "interview" that from the first line to the last was full of piquant disclosures and suggestions. Its effect was immediate and prodigious. In Germany Prince Bülow promptly offered to resign, and the entire German people turned against their Kaiser in something like a frenzy of execration. In England there was an explosion of amazed laughter at the officiousness of the Kaiser in volunteering a plan of campaign for defeating his friends, the Boers. In France and Russia every newspaper and Government official set to work at once to disprove the Kaiser's story of the intervention. All Europe was for days convulsed with denials and explanations, charges and countercharges. The truth is, I believe, that Russia did actually propose and that France was not unwilling to entertain a scheme for putting pressure on Great Britain to bring the South-African war to a conclusion. Englishmen feel they can afford to forget it nowadays or, if they remember it at all, it is without the least trace of vindictiveness, and merely as a relic of an unhappy and outworn period in British diplomatic history. But the reason why the scheme fell through was that Germany's co-operation in it was made conditional on a formal acquiescence by France in the permanent loss of Alsace-Lorraine. M. Delcassé thought the price too high and the conspirators disbanded. It was not from any kindly feeling towards the English, but simply to serve the ends of her European policy, that Germany put forward the stipulation which killed the project almost before it was born. The Kaiser was as willing to sacrifice England for the sake of Alsace-Lorraine as to sacrifice the Boers for the sake of placating England. Thanks to the further revelations called forth by the "Daily Telegraph" interview, this is now well understood in England; and Anglo-German relations, I need hardly add, are not improved thereby.

CONSTANTINOPLE, November, 1908.

Soon after the downfall of absolutism in the Ottoman Empire the Young Turks with a forefeeling of their country's future greatness asked whether they might not in time aspire to re-enter into possession of Crete, Cyprus, Egypt, Samos, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Sanjak of Novi Bazar. A legitimate patriotic dream. Well, it was this harmless aspiration that furnished Baron von Aehrenthal with the pretext for which he longed. And it was soon supplemented by petitions in which the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina craved a constitution such as their fellow subjects in Turkey had received. Now the bestowal of a constitution, the Austrian Foreign Minister argued, implies annexation. It is as needless to discuss this thesis as it would have been for the lamb in the fable to adduce arguments against the allegations of the wolf. It was a case of "*hoc volo, sic jubeo*." Austria disposes of a formidable army. Germany, who will see her through the crisis, possesses an army more formidable still. Turkey, on the other hand, is literally defenceless, and the three Powers willing to back her can offer nothing more helpful than moral sympathies, with which she could not defend Adrianople or Dedeaghattch. And in order that Turkey and her pacific friends should realize the situation, Austria dexterously thrust Prince Ferdinand forward and alarmed Europe with the spectre of a Turco-Bulgarian war.

In Vienna, Sofia, Constantinople, Paris and St. Petersburg I have had the privilege within the span of a few weeks of hearing most of the actors in this European drama give their own version of each of the acts and also their candid opinions of their fellow actors. And having winnowed sentiment from fact in these graphic sketches I find it impossible to avoid the conclusion that the brilliancy of the *coup* accomplished by Baron von Aehrenthal is dulled by certain of the methods to which he had recourse in order to achieve it. To affirm that the elaborate hoodwinking of the diplomatic representatives of foreign states, the conveying of erroneous impressions by implication and allusion whereby they were caused to mislead their respective Governments very materially, were amongst that Minister's methods, is to put a strong case with generous euphemism. That Baron von Aehrenthal resembles the bee which, having left its sting in the wound, can never again inflict pain, is the obvious inference.

In September, the Austrian Embassies, seconding the work of Baron von Aehrenthal, assured the press of the countries to which they were accredited that the intention attributed to Austria-Hungary of annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina, and thus violating the Berlin Treaty, had no existence in fact, and these assurances and statements were credited at the time because Austria possessed an excellent reputation for plain dealing and her Foreign Secretary was believed to be acquiring one.

One of the legends disseminated by the Austrian Government was that Bulgaria had no intention of proclaiming her independence, because, among other reasons, Austria-Hungary would surely know of it. She had been informed of such a plan last year, for instance, it was added, when she promptly vetoed it; and she had heard nothing this year from the Bulgarian Cabinet about any such project. This statement, literally true and really false, was duly transmitted by the embassies in Vienna to their respective Governments. The Bulgarian Cabinet in the persons of its most influential members put a very different complexion on the matter. And this is what they told me. The Principality was ripe for independence long ago, but the leaders of the nation had patriotically resolved to wait until the Bulgars of Macedonia were incorporated in Prince Ferdinand's realm, which then, without more ado, would become a kingdom and independent simultaneously. And patience was all the more easy that Bulgaria was a vassal only in name—a name, too, that brought her no inconvenience and great advantages, political and economic, and that the reward of her good behavior was already in sight. The Powers had lost patience with the Sultan, the three Macedonian provinces would soon be withdrawn from his sceptre and then Bulgaria's dream would come true.

These hopes were dashed by the emancipation of Turkey from the demoralizing absolutism of Abdul Hamid. Turkey's integrity was henceforward safe from attack. As there was now, therefore, no longer anything to be gained by waiting, it was resolved that the declaration of independence should be made without delay. But delay was unavoidable because the Prince and the Premier were both absent.

Baron von Aehrenthal, still protesting that Bulgaria would not declare her independence, had royal honors shown to Prince Ferdinand on his entry into Budapest. At the same time mem-

bers of the Bulgarian cabinet, and in particular the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, was telling his friends in Sofia that Austria-Hungary was about to tear up the Treaty of Berlin by annexing the occupied provinces and that Bulgaria would follow her example. And yet the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs got no inkling of this semi-public information!

Young Turkey through all her bewildering troubles continued to manifest an attitude so moderate, so generous and so statesmanlike that friends and adversaries alike augured genial things of the great unknown counsellors behind the cabinet. To the annexation of the occupied provinces she replied with a dignified protest and a reasonable demand for pecuniary compensation; Bulgaria's independence would, she intimated, be duly acknowledged by the Porte simultaneously with recognition by the signatory Powers, but her property rights in the railway and the Roumelian tribute did not, she contended, lapse with the nominal vassalage of Bulgaria. The anonymous committee that guides the policy of the Empire from the safe retreat of Salonica, went further in the path of conciliation. An unofficial deputation was sent to Sofia to fraternize with the Bulgars and assure them that as the two nations would need each other's help in the future they had better begin friendly negotiations at once. I talked with the Turkish delegates in Sofia and with the Bulgarian delegates there and in Constantinople. They were all anxious for a close friendship preparatory to an alliance between the two states.

But the trials, internal and external, of constitutional Turkey are by no means at an end. To Austria her very existence is an eyesore and her prosperity would be a standing menace. A Turco-Bulgarian alliance, once the Ottoman army is reorganized, would effectually thwart the ambitious designs of the Hapsburgs and force Germany to abandon all hope of recovering the unique position of influence in Turkey which she lost when Abdul Hamid was deprived of power.

Although the danger of war seems past, a dark storm-cloud still hangs heavy in the Eastern sky. Bulgaria continues to overstrain her financial resources and check commercial enterprise by keeping fifty thousand superfluous soldiers under arms and Turkey has come to a complete standstill at a moment when quiescence is almost identical with retrogression. At present external difficulties are her bane. These once removed, her chances

of coping successfully with domestic troubles would perhaps rise to the level of probability.

But one cannot blink the fact that hitherto achievement has fallen far short of promise. Hitherto the Young Turks have been seemingly vying with the ancient Christians in the practice of self-denial, meekness, brotherly love, humility and other negative virtues. Government as they have established it has a certain remote resemblance to the anarchy tempered with altruism which was sung by Shelley and is preached by Tolstoy.

But with negative qualities, even though they be Christian virtues, one cannot build up an Empire. And creative, nay constructive, forces are nowhere visible as yet. Young Turkey lacks leaders for the reform movement and, what perhaps is worse, she lacks intelligent, trustworthy, energetic partisans. True, strong characters, magnetic shepherds of men, may emerge from the seething whirl of races and religions, but as yet there is none in view. And the feat to be achieved is hardly less arduous than a mediæval miracle. A powerful nation has to be fashioned out of ethnic fragments that have hitherto repelled in lieu of attracting each other. An army has to be got together out of excellent human materials, it is true, but without experienced generals, tested strategists, trusty non-commissioned officers, ammunition, clothing or money. In like manner the navy must be created out of nothing. Further, tribunals are waiting for a cleansing such as Hercules gave the stables of the King of Elis.

Then presumably education will perpetuate the barriers that divide Greek from Turk, Arab, Armenian, Kurd and Albanian, while religion with its large infusion of politics must tend to keep Christian, Jew and Moslem from fusing with each other in Ottoman citizenship. And as the races and religions are scattered throughout the Empire, the task of the future Empire-builders is in truth Herculean and calls for an organizing genius. And yet there is good hope.

As the Turkish revolution was a miracle of moderation and thoroughness, in the possibility of which nobody would have believed on the eve of its accomplishment, so it is but fair that we hold back our forecast of the Ottoman renaissance until we have seen the Turkish Parliament assembled, when possibly another miracle may evoke our admiration and quicken our faith in the potentialities of man.

WASHINGTON, November, 1908.

AMONG the innumerable students of the returns of the late Presidential election, there are many who have drawn the inference that Mr. Bryan will never again run for the Presidency, and there are some who, under the first shock of disappointment, have gone so far as to say that we shall never see another Democratic Chief Magistrate. The veteran politicians of whom the Federal capital is full are inclined to think that the former forecast will be verified, although there is some doubt about it; but that the latter is by no means warranted by the facts. Assuming that the official figures will give Mr. Bryan the three electoral votes of Nevada, six out of eight electoral votes of Maryland and the five electoral votes of Colorado, we can see that he will have 162 electoral votes; or, in other words, 22 more electoral votes than were cast for ex-Judge Parker; 7 more than Bryan himself obtained in 1900, but 14 less than he got in 1896. It must also be said for him that he carried his own State of Nebraska, which had not delivered its electoral vote to a Democrat since 1896, and that he secured all the electoral votes of Kentucky, whereas he got but one of them twelve years ago. The fact remains that his Republican opponent will have almost twice as many electoral votes as he, and that, as regards the popular vote, the Republican plurality now exceeds 1,100,000, or is nearly twice as large as it was in 1896.

It is premature and optimistic, however, to take for granted that Bryan has retired from the field. He retains the power of putting himself continually before the people in the columns of his paper, "The Commoner," and he has announced that he will resume immediately the lecture tours which in the past have brought him a considerable revenue. It must not be forgotten, either, that in our political history there are some precedents for his persistency in aspiring to the office of Chief Magistrate. In 1789, 1792 and 1796 George Clinton of New York obtained more or less electoral votes for the Presidency, securing no fewer than 50 in the second of the years named, while in 1804 and 1808, he was actually elected Vice-President. Suppose Bryan should follow George Clinton's example, and, after running three times unsuccessfully for the Presidency, should accept a nomination for Vice-President in 1912? Let us look next at the experience of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney of South Carolina. He was a

candidate for the Presidency in 1796, but got only one electoral vote. He obtained 64 in 1800; 14 in 1804 and 47 in 1808. Henry Clay's example is still more suggestive. He got 34 electoral votes in 1824; 49 in 1832; 105 in 1844; and he was the most conspicuous candidate for the Whig nomination in 1848, and he would have got it had not Thurlow Weed, by his adroit wire-pulling, managed to beat him with Zachary Taylor. That is to say, the friends of Henry Clay in the Whig Convention of 1848 took the same position which the friends of Mr. Bryan would occupy should they request his nomination from the Democratic National Convention in 1912. With these examples and precedents at his fingers' ends, it is improbable that Mr. Bryan is as yet ready to acknowledge himself politically dead. Such, at least, is the opinion of some Washington observers who possess long memories. Whether, in view of this year's lesson, the American Democracy will ever again consent to make Mr. Bryan its standard-bearer, is a very different question. He has never been as popular with his party as Henry Clay was with the Whigs, who, nevertheless, put Clay aside in 1848—and won.

If, now, we turn to the Democracy, hypothetically considered as henceforth dissociated from Mr. Bryan's personal fortunes, it is certain that some cause for hope, rather than for discouragement, is discernible. There are proofs, on the face of the returns, that this year the general conditions were far less favorable to the success of the Republican party than they were in 1904. We must also recognize incontestable proofs that those Democrats who vehemently urged the Denver Convention to put forward some other standard-bearer than Bryan were abundantly justified. Not only have the Democrats made considerable gains in the House of Representatives, but, through the Legislatures just chosen, they will have gained also some United States Senators. Above all, they have elected Governors in Ohio, Indiana, Minnesota and North Dakota, although every one of those States was carried by Taft. They have come very near to electing Governors in West Virginia, Michigan and even Illinois. It is now pretty clear that such a Democratic ticket as Harmon and Stevenson, or Harmon and Johnson, would have come near to subverting Republican ascendancy in the Central West. It is not, therefore, the Democratic party, but Mr. Bryan personally, who seems to have been discredited and disqualified by the late Presidential election. In

view of this indubitable fact, there is at last good reason to hope that the Democracy has shaken from its shoulders the man whose incessant strivings for the Presidency have kept his party disunited for a dozen years. When we bear in mind that, judged by the ballots cast for Governors, the Republican plurality of the popular vote does not much exceed 400,000, we cannot but recognize that the Democratic party is better fitted than it has been since Grover Cleveland went out of office in March, 1897, to discharge the duties of an Opposition. It is fortunate for Republicans themselves that the Democracy has gained control of the State Governments in so many Northern States; for the fact will force them to watch the drift of intelligent opinion in those important, if not pivotal, commonwealths.

Is Mr. Roosevelt's influence waning rapidly? Of course, Republican office-seekers have already turned their faces from the setting to the rising sun. Already the pall of effacement, which has enfolded so many ex-Presidents, is beginning to cast its shadow on the man who has only about three months longer in which to retain the office of Chief Magistrate. The fate of many of his predecessors may well depress him. Jefferson, and, for that matter, Madison, left the White House bankrupts. Obscure and pitiful was the existence to which the author of the Monroe Doctrine was condemned in his last years. What had Franklin Pierce or Chester A. Arthur to fall back upon? Benjamin Harrison was glad, in his retirement, to accept a fee from a railway corporation. Grover Cleveland consented to become an employee of a life-insurance company. John Quincy Adams and Andrew Johnson alone insisted upon proving that they retained capacities of public usefulness by returning to public life at Washington, the one as Representative, the other as a Senator. Mr. Roosevelt, apparently, expects to keep himself in the public eye by imitating Mr. Bryan—that is to say, by accepting an editorial post on a weekly periodical, though in his past we can find no reason for assuming that, once stripped of the aureole of the Presidency, he is qualified to discharge the editorial function. It is the opinion of many close observers at Washington that Mr. Roosevelt has made a blunder in his choice of a post-Presidential profession, and that there was just one sagacious thing for him to do, and that was to become a member of the United States Senate.